

From the Philadelphia American Sentinel.

TO FREEMEN.

Fellow-Citizens. Our opponents, who dare not vindicate the manner of Adams' election, as it is whimsically denominated, now call upon us to judge of the administration by its acts, and by them alone. The acts of a despot may be righteous, but even such acts will hardly justify, to a free nation, the character or principles of despotism. In a despotic government, the order or the mere word of a tyrant imposes an obligation more forcible, and held more sacred too, even than the injunctions of religion. John Q. Adams, like his father, is much fonder of a strong government than an honest one. I think they are both wrong, and I should not fear, even from the lights afforded to me by our own history, to prove that government acquires strength by its integrity, and that the best means of concentrating the powers and resources of a great nation are to be found in its perfect freedom. Of this fact we have the best proof in a successful contest with the strongest nation in the world at a moment too when that nation was flushed with victory, and all her sea and land forces in a state of perfect organization. But if we are to speak of the acts of Adams' administration, to say nothing of the act by which he himself got into power, what are we to say of the flagrant foreign nation commanded by a native and a persecuted American, one of the most gallant and skillful officers that the world ever saw? Was it not openly affirmed in Congress by one of his judges, that matter had been officially withheld, the production of which would alter the whole case? What Adams act upon this? He did not! What was the continuance of pay to a man like Porter, compared to a soldier's name? A poor, pitiful, contemptuous mercy. I myself saw this brave fellow, and marked the dejected behavior of his visage, while a venal press was propagating his slanders and completing the work that had been left unfinished at Washington. What, I ask, was Adams' conduct in the Panama business, but a contemptuous disregard of the demands and requisitions of Congress? Even when the executive communication was made, it absolutely contained nothing which, from reasons of state, it could be deemed politic to withhold, even for a moment! In other nations, the representatives of the people, as they are called, are often flouted in this manner by the minister of the tool of power, but no friend to liberty, even under kingly rule, would so use them. Adams went further, for even upon constitutional grounds, he attempted to impeach the right of the call, thus placing himself above the people, or what is the same thing, their "express image," as it existed in Congress assembled. Other matters will be presented in due course; but enough is now before my fellow countrymen to show them that power will be maintained by means quite as objectionable as the one by which it was first acquired. Adams, it is true, is upheld by men of fine talents, but the republicanism, the democracy, of the nation is against him. As an American, I am too proud of Webster's genius to deny him my admiration; but as a democrat, I am too suspicious of his party to give him my confidence; wherever or upon whomsoever in that party you look you find the traces of a foreign policy, the love of power, a deep-rooted distrust, an ill-humored hatred of popular authority, the only authority that consists with freedom and self-government. The holy alliance itself desires nothing beyond this. How different it is with our champion, the man of the people, plain, honest, dread-naught Old Hickory! Wherever you look for him you find him—not inclining to this side or that—not juggling with this political man or with that whiffling scoundrel for office, but ever vertical to the line which bounds the good man's view.

LYSIMACHUS.

[From the Daily Chronicle, published in Albany New-York.

PITIFUL.

We observe it is stated in some of our papers, that a writer in the Richmond Whig, is endeavoring to prove, or rather is endeavoring to impress a belief, that Gen. Adair, and not Gen. Jackson, is entitled to the honor of gaining the victory of New-Orleans. This wicked, distasteful, and withal, absurd attempt, is doubtless made to have an effect on the next Presidential election; but no sensible and true American can be so far-fetched as his feelings or prejudices, as to justify the use of such means to effect any personal or political object. If honest men are opposed to General Jackson, they will use honest and honorable means in their opposition. But, as well might an attempt be made to take from General Washington, or any other of our Revolutionary heroes, the credit due to their noblest and most successful deeds, as to deprive General Jackson of the glory which he acquired, in saving New-Orleans from the pillage and brutality of a ruthless invader, and nobly defending the post against a vastly superior numerical force.

The present Secretary of State, in voting for the former incumbent of that office, in opposition to the wishes of the people of the United States, did so in violation of the wishes and request of the people and Legislature of Kentucky, of which State he was a Representative. Knowing that his conduct required an apology, he assigned as a reason for the violation of duty, that it was in conformity to "safe precedent" to raise the Secretary of State to the Presidency. Does it not appear, from this act, that the order of succession to the Presidency exercised a stronger bias on his mind than the influence of Republican principles could produce upon it? And was it consistent with the delicacy of feeling which should predominate in the bosom of a patriot, after having given such a vote and assigned such a reason for it, for him to accept the office which furnishes so powerful a claim to the Presidency, as to be paramount, in his estimation, even to the will of the people, who have no agency in designating a Secretary of State?

U. S. Telegraph.

It is stated in the Raleigh Register of the 29th ult. on the authority of a correspondent, who has seen a copy of the articles of agreement entered into between Com. Porter and the Mexican Government, that the Government have granted to the Commodore, the payment of a claim on the old Mexican Government of 50 or 60,000 dollars for destroying Privateers. The Navy is placed under his entire control; he selects all his officers—he is to locate a certain quantity of land where he pleases, and he is to be created an Admiral at the next Congress.

LOUISIANA ELECTION.

From the Louisville (Ky.) Public Advertiser.

The administration prints are already boasting, because there has been no change in the Representation of Louisiana in Congress. There has not been more than 6200 votes given for members of Congress in that State. Out of about 2200, given in Mr. Livingston's district, he received a majority of 933. Out of 2400 given in Mr. Gurley's district, Mr. G. had a majority of 1151 but counting the votes given to both Hamilton and Bradford, Gurley's majority was only about 80 votes. It thus appears that in the districts represented by Livingston and Gurley, there was a majority opposed to the administration, of more than 800 votes.—Louisiana will be true to herself, and to the man who gallantly and successfully defended her in the late war.

Since writing the above we have received returns from the parishes of St. Landry, Rapides, and Avoyelles—which gave Brent 388, Brownson 145, Flajoux 38. Total—Brent 685, Brownson 562, Flajoux 43. Brent's majority over his two opponents, 75 votes.

If what we have heard, be true, and we believe it to be so, the seat of Mr. B. ought to be considered as vacated, he being at this time, and indeed, for some time past, a citizen of Maryland.

From the Jackson Democrat.

GENERAL JACKSON.

There who have their full share of the issue between this popular individual and Mr. Adams, have taken up a new mode of attack. And as it is made by the presses in the immediate pay of Mr. Adams, it has a fortiori more effect. It must however be recollected upon Mr. Adams, and only have the effect of increasing the number of General Jackson's friends. During the past winter, every man of influence attached to the cause of General Jackson, was assailed with a wantonness and malignity, altogether unparalleled in our political annals (saying always those of the reign of terror) this has not satisfied those, whose bread and butter are purchased by detraction, and desperate calumny—blood-hound like in their chase, they attack indiscriminately, all who may be in their way; their attacks upon these individuals were but a prelude to the present one on General Jackson. Were we to say that Mr. Adams has no acquisitions, no talents, no statistical abilities, what would be said?—The voice of the people, of reason, and of facts, would stamp us, with the just character of false, insidious, and foolish knaves—what then shall be the reward of those, who are now spreading tantamount assertions to these, before the public, intending to deprive General Jackson of even the property of his military actions?—The Richmond Whig, The National Journal, and the Democratic Press, have already detailed the ridiculous falsehood, of the victory of New-Orleans, being properly attributable to General Adair! that his military talents and judgment directed all these operations which gained so much glory for our arms and security for our country! The hardihood which could attempt to pass off such base coin upon the people, whilst it exhibits the depravity of the workers in iniquity, must furnish a strong ground of objection to Mr. Adams. If he folds his arms, and permits his agents, to utter such slanders of the man of the people, assuredly the day of retribution will come, and the indignation of an insulted and aggrieved community, convince him that such conduct has doomed him to a perpetual infamy.

The Savannah Republican of the 12th inst. takes the annexed notice of the attempt made by the Richmond Whig to detract from the well earned reputation of General Jackson.

The Richmond Whig, a sturdy Adams paper, informs us, that the American public will receive in a short time, an investigation of the events which preceded the battle of New-Orleans, in which it will be shown that to General Adair, of Kentucky, is due the glory of saving New-Orleans, and for the ever memorable victory of the 8th of January, 1815.

What nonsense! Folly itself cannot be so deluded as to believe that any man, other than Andrew Jackson, was the saviour of the West. The fame of the hero of New-Orleans stands on too firm a basis to be sullied by the puny whippersnappers of the day.

J. C. CALHOUN.

From the United States Telegraph. The Editors of "Coram's Champion" make the following judicious remarks, in reference to the freedom of debate in the Senate of the United States, which freedom has been secured by the Rules of that body, framed under the Constitution. The malice, fraud, and violence, with which the Vice President has been assailed for not violating those Rules, has no parallel in this country since the time emphatically styled the "Reign of Terror." Misrepresentation and acrimony have been essayed to make him swear from duty, but he has fearlessly pursued the course adopted under similar circumstances by the venerable Jefferson, and like him has borne the rancorous abuse of the malignant partisans of power.

If the Vice President has erred, and willfully, as he is accused of having done, by his assistant, he should have been formally and constitutionally impeached, and before that body over which he presided, and not attacked by the President, under an anonymous signature. But the cause of this attack is evidently to injure the political influence of Mr. Calhoun, as Mr. Adams is aware that he will be opposed to his election at the next trial. The construction of the Constitution is a delicate point. The Senate have evidently the same opinion as Mr. Calhoun, putting it, as it has done, in the power of every member to call another to order, and compelling him to reduce to writing the offensive words, and submit them to its President, before the Senate can act upon the subject, and decide whether the gentleman so called to order was deviating from the subject matter in discussion. Not having the rules of the Senate before us, it is not recollected in what year the rule by which Mr. Calhoun thought himself bound to act, was adopted; but an attendance of eleven years enables us to say, that in no instance have we heard the presiding officer call a member to order, although several instances are in recollection in which members have called each other to order. To us it appears that Mr. Calhoun has pursued the usual course, right or wrong. It seems the Senate thought him right, and it is presumptuous to differ from that learned and venerable assembly, which is certainly the best interpreter of its own rules.

LAW OF TRESPASS, &c.

Agreeably to request, we insert "The Law of Trespass" as in the American Farmer, No. 33, vol. 3, page 179, and the several letters which we extract from letter in vol. 6 page 308.

LAW OF TRESPASS.

[From a Correspondent.] Washington, Aug. 3, 1826.

My dear Sir.—Pardon me for trespassing upon your time, but I would be much obliged to you if you have the means to inform me, whether there have been any decisions in Maryland, similar in principle to what is laid down by Mr. Boyle, as the laws of trespass or damage feasant, and published in Vol. 6, American Farmer, the case he refers to, in the previous volume, does not appear clear.

My neighbour will not repair his fence between my woods and his fields; my cattle go over his decayed panels and he sues me for damages, and I fear he will recover, though I prove his fence to be not over three feet in height—and I am told that the old law of Maryland, 1715, is not applicable, and that decisions have been given to this effect, that every man must keep up his cattle, and that if they run upon another's land, though uninclosed, or with an insufficient fence, the owner of the cattle is liable to damages.

Decisions in Maryland have been given in conformity with Mr. Boyle's opinion, which appears the only true principle, the publication of one or more of them would have a good effect in saving expenses of litigation. If you have leisure pray let me hear from you.

Believe me,

Very truly, yours, &c.

CHARLES J. NOURSE.

[The above having been forwarded to Mr. Boyle, of Annapolis, with the request of the Editor of the American Farmer, to make some notes upon it; he has politely communicated the following; the subject is highly interesting to every landholder.]

Mr. Skinner, In answer to Mr. Nourse's letter which you have forwarded to me, I have no remark to make excepting that the act of April, 1715 ch. 31, has not been acted upon. The juries have invariably set their faces against that act, for reasons which it would be difficult to explain. In some cases because they thought the act of assembly applied only to horses, and in others, because they were of opinion the fence for general purposes was too high. No decision has been made by the Court of Appeals on that act, mentioned in Mr. Nourse's letter. I have no hesitation in saying that the act will not extend to any beasts (damage feasant, except "horses, mares, colts and geldings.")

The law relating to damage feasant, as mentioned in my letter, published in Vol. 6, p. 102, is the common law, and forms a part of the law of Maryland. The law of trespass is there fully laid down. No decision could be found upon this subject in Maryland, because the law was decided many years before the colonization of the province took place.

The whole of the difference of opinion takes place about the meaning of fences, and inclosed or uninclosed grounds. It never was designed by the Legislature, that a man should be compelled to enclose lands which he considered waste or common; though a division fence might be very important to his neighbour. In this state there are no regulations by statute, respecting fences, except the above mentioned act of 1715, which extends only to horses, &c. In other states there are many and various laws.

In New York, a law was passed on the 27th March, 1801, and a similar law some years afterwards, by which it is enacted that division fences between persons whose lands join, are to be made at the joint expense of both, except such persons shall choose to let their lands or meadows lay open and vacant. It is provided, that any person may throw open his land for common, on giving three months notice. When beasts damage feasant have been distrained, the distrainer shall, within twenty-four hours, apply to the nearest fence viewers, to ascertain the damage—So much for New York.

In Massachusetts, an act for regulating fences, passed February 21, 1786, very much like that which New York subsequently passed.

In the different States various laws have been enacted very generally alike. I shall content myself with referring only to the civil code of Louisiana, which will immortalize its compiler, and stands unequalled, (except by its precursor, the code Napoleon,) and which enacts—"In the country the common boundary enclosure between two estates is made at their joint expense, if the estates are enclosed; otherwise the estate which is not enclosed, is not bound to contribute to it." This is in fact, the pith of the whole affair. If a division fence has been kept up for years, both parties are bound to keep it in repair, unless one of them can make it appear that the fence is no longer of use to him. The common law upon this subject has never been adjudicated in Maryland, because it is an ancient law. A man is bound to keep his horses, &c. up, or they may be impounded. The distrainer has no right to do any thing more than impound, or turn them away. (Vide 6 Har. & Johns. Rep. 230, Knott vs. Digge.)

On lands which have never been enclosed, or which having been enclosed, become useless to one of the parties, he is not bound to enclose or repair.

At common law, the tenant of a close was not obliged to fence against an adjoining close, unless by prescription; but he was at his peril to keep his cattle on his own close, and prevent them from escaping. (Iust vs. Low & al, 6 Massachusetts T. R. 90.)

I have the honour to be,

Yours, &c.

JAMES BOYLE.

To the Editor of the American Farmer.

Annapolis Nov. 24, 1824. Dear Sir.—When you reached this, I was attending Montgomery County Court, where my professional engagements, necessarily detained me for nearly a fortnight, & on my return, have found a very sick family, which, with an accumulation of business during my absence, required immediate attention. These concurring circumstances prevented my attending earlier to your request. In truth, I may be said to do it now, by stealth.

The case of Lloyd and Tilghman, mentioned in the American Farmer, vol. 5, No. 33, fol. 264, is unknown to me. It has not been reported, and I expect contains no new principle of law, but would be found, if examined, to be only a declaration of the common law relating to damage feasant, and which I will endeavour to explain, and illustrate, concisely, and get it fully, as my time will permit.

Damage feasant, is when the beasts of another, no way priory to the estate, are found in a man's close, without the leave of the owner of the land, and without the fault of the possessor of the close; (which may happen from his not repairing his fences) and their doing damage, which may be by feeding, or trampling, or otherwise, to the grass, corn, young timber, woods, &c.

If the beasts (which is the law phrase) are damage feasant, the person whom they damage, may distrain and impound them, as well by night as by day; and he may keep them in the pound, until satisfied of the damages, and the law presumes the owner of the cattle always to know of the cattle being there, damage feasant.

If the party injured, does not wish to impound, he may resort to his action of trespass.

It may be necessary here, to define the meaning of a pound. Pounds are of three kinds—common, open and close. In this state there is no common pound, but there may be open and close pounds. An open pound (not common but private) is any secure, uninclosed place, in which the cattle are placed. A close pound is, for instance, a part of the distrainer's house, stable, &c. and he is bound to feed them in either.

In England, a common pound belongs to the township, lordship or village; and in every parish ought to be kept in repair by those who have done it by immemorial custom. It is the duty of the steward in the sect to attend to this, before whom any default is punishable.

Hogs running at large, has been a complaint in this state for many years. No legislative provision has been made, and it is a very difficult subject to legislate on. The population of our country is very sparse, the plantations and farms large, the lines of division fences very long, and above all, the labouring part composed of slaves, who are constitutionally indolent, and whose interest is at variance with the master's. It being the interest of the matter to obtain industrious labour, and of the slave, to perform no more than will screen him from chastisement. In consequence of this, there is a constant hurry on the farm, and the fences are miserably neglected.

JAMES BOYLE.

FROM PONCE.

By an arrival at Boston from Ponce, Porto Rico, we learn that about the 23d July, "an intended insurrection among the blacks, near that place, had been discovered, and the principal leader apprehended. It appears that their plan was to go in the night to the doors of the white inhabitants as they passed on the road to Ponce, and give the alarm of fire, and as the white people came out of their houses to murder them. They intended, the better to carry their plan into effect, and to draw the whites out, to set fire to some of the estates nearest to Ponce, and then rush into the place, and get possession of the Arsenal, where the arms of the militia were deposited, arm themselves, and destroy all the whites. They were discovered by a black slave, who informed his master. The authorities had taken up, and examined a great many slaves, and had found twenty-four of the principal leaders, who it was supposed would be condemned to death on the arrival of the Captain General, from the city of Porto Rico, who was daily expected."

HEALTH OF MOBILE.

The Register of August 9th says:—"The prevailing epidemic appears rather to increase of late. A number of cases of malignant fever have occurred in the City within the last few days, and it seems to be the general impression that the present aspect in regard to health is more unfavourable than it has been."

COLOMBIA.

By the Antelope at Baltimore in sixteen days from La Guayra, advices to the 13th ult. have been received. A letter to the editor of the Gazette, dated on the 15th, says:—"Since I last wrote to you, Alisandra, nothing new has transpired in this place. The Colombian schooner Repulencia, arrived here this morning in two days from Porto Cabello, with the news of Maracaibo and Carthagena having openly declared in favour of the federative system, as wished for by Paez; it is therefore supposed by many, that the government at Bogota will now see the necessity of adopting the measure."

DESHA.

It appears that the report of Desha's death, published in several of the papers of this city a few days since, is not true. A letter from Cynthia Desha, where he is confined, from Frankfort, contained the following here considered him out of danger, as to death from the wound."

POKE ROOT.

Chambersburg, (Penn.) Aug. 29. The Poke Root and the advantage of taking a newspaper.—Last week, Mr. Samuel M'Ilroy, of Green township, called at the office to inform us, of his having had occasion to test the efficacy of the Recipe for the bite of a snake, published in the Repository of the 8th inst., from the Staington Spectator. He stated that a Horse of his had a few days before, been bitten in the jaw whilst at pasture, which was not discovered until he had during the morning been completely heated in the plough. Having just perused the Recipe alluded to, Mr. M. determined to try it, so active was the poison, that before it could be prepared the swelling had so greatly extended that the horse was unable to swallow. After the poultice was on a considerable time, the swelling still continued and the horse apparently grew worse, so much so indeed as to almost destroy all hope of saving his life—it was determined to try other remedies; but upon removing the poultice it was discovered that the swelling had extended no higher on the head of the horse than it was when it was put on—this favourable appearance induced a further trial—a fresh poultice was accordingly applied, the swelling soon began to subside, and the horse recovered in a single day! Mr. M'Ilroy further stated, that he once lost a valuable horse bitten in the same way by a snake—that he had but faint hopes of saving this one when he first applied the poke root poultice; and joyously added I call on purpose to tell you, of the benefit I have received from taking your paper."

ABSENCE OF MIND.

La Fontaine once called to see a friend whose funeral he had attended.

THE BURNING.

From the Schenectady Republican. A travelling Tinker, named John, from the town of "Wooden nags," and here, you find him while moving with his portable saw, through an adjoining town, called upon by a very shrewd descendant, called upon in other words, a pretty, lively, and well-bred young man, who having on hand a Pennsylvania very fine one for disposing of, besides the immortal honour he would acquire by having "suck'd" in a Yankee fellow, consideration of no small importance, being generally believed a very difficult thing to accomplish. He accordingly, after the by-standers, offered his plan, and requested the change. The Tinker looked grave, and shook his head, and said, "the bill, he said, he had the bank was down. Crispin said he was no such thing—the report was set at naught by brokers and speculators, men not to be trusted as to the bills were perfectly good as good as specie—and as to that matter, little better, because it was less trouble to carry it;" and all the spectators joined in him, in recommending the bill to be a "repute." The bill being so highly recommended, the unsuspecting Tinker put his by-standers upon long faces—the Tinker laughed behind his ears, and no one really honest but the pedlar. But he did not stop here; Crispin, elated by his success, offered to sell the man of the lot of shoes, at a reduced price for the pedlar bargained for them at \$12.00, the shoes in his cart-bag—paid amount in Pittsburgh bills—and down he went, whistling the old tune of "a Weazel Asleep."

PERU.

From Peru, we learn authentically, of the members elected to Congress, a great object of which was the formation of a new organization of Government, at 40 out of 77 or 78 members, were collected together at Lima, in the month of April. Without assembling for the purpose of organizing the Congress, they addressed Liberator Bolivar, with the most respectful supplication, to continue for another year, as Dictator. The Liberator resisted the suggestion for a time, but at last acceded to the request, and the members of the Congress dispersed without having seen the exercise of the functions for which they were elected. There existed a strong opinion against conferring the absolute authority on the Liberator; but from the occurrence above narrated, it is inferred that the people in favour of the measure was still strong.

SKETCHES.

[From Sketches of Parisian Society, in New Monthly Magazine.] I will relate to you a ludicrous little venture which took place at the house of one of our ministers who is remarkable for the gravity and the hauteur of his manner. He invited to dinner a poet, a member of the Institute, a man distinguished for extensive diffidence and absence of mind, a Jesuit. The poet somewhat astonished receiving an invitation from his Excellency made his appearance in the dress of a black coat, embroidered with green silk, a sword. What was his consternation, on entering the drawing room, he found that he was the only person in official costume, all the rest of the company being in plain dresses! The sword which dangled awkwardly by his side, striking his legs, impeding every motion, was the most conspicuous part of his costume; and when a company were summoned to the table, he contrived to remain behind the rest, taking his sword from his side, he hid under the cushions of an ottoman. During the evening, the company returned to the drawing room, and the wife of the minister and some other ladies seated themselves on the ottoman. About 9 o'clock the company began to depart, and only few of the minister's particular friends remained. It was the fitting moment for the poet to take his departure, he still kept his seat. At eleven o'clock almost all the company were gone, and when twelve came the poet was left alone with the minister and his wife. His excellency naturally concluded that he had some favour to solicit, but length finding that he said not a word, he wished him good night, and left him alone with his wife. The lady who was reclining on the ottoman, was not a little astonished at the poet's protracted stay. A poor member of the Institute, overwhelmed with confusion, was very silent and dull, and at length the lady, oppressed by drowsiness, closed her eyes.

The poet thought this a favourable moment for regaining possession of his sword. He cautiously approached the lady, and putting his hand beneath the cushion, seized the hilt of his sword, but not having reached the scabbard, he drew out only the sheathed blade. To facilitate this sword extraction, the poet knelt down, and just as he had extricated the sword from its hiding place, the point touched the lady's foot. She opened her eyes, and what was her amazement to behold the poet on his knees, prostrate and trembling, and holding a drawn sword in his hand pointed towards her. I will transcribe the very curious prayer which some ill-natured persons affirm, was uttered by the devout Minister's lady on this occasion. She thought herself about to be married by an insane lover. The poet uttered an unintelligible explanation, and hastily retreated sword in hand, while the lady in her terror exclaimed that he was a monster. The friends of the minister affirmed that this is an old story, that the affair had happened two or three years ago, and that celebrated geometrical was the hero of the adventure. But the real fact is, that the dinner took place last week.

A MISER.

The Scotsman says—"Joseph M'William was burnt to death lately in Roseat, Perthshire. This man denied himself every comfort and convenience of life—not a bed, chair or table was in his house. After his death, the place was searched, and there were found many receipts for the enormous sum of £4500 per 100, besides the title-deeds of household property exceeding £1,100 in value! Mr. Coome, his brother-in-law, who lived immediately above Mr. M'William's house, has observed that the miser wore the same outer garment for upwards of 15 years."

Maryland Gazette.

ANNAPOLIS: THURSDAY, SEPT. 7, 1826.

Mr. Maxcy's reply to a Correspondent, will appear in our next.

ELECTORAL ELECTION.

City of Annapolis. 1827-1828. Richard Harwood, of Thos. 151 Dr. Desha's Candidate, 158

In Anne-Brundel County, Gen. William H. Marriott and Mr. Estep, were elected. The following is a statement of the polls in the several

DISTRICTS. No. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Total W. R. Marriott, 129 74 79 187 152 102 723 Estep, 239 56 53 105 97 73 623 Harrod, 152 66 52 88 62 94 544

In the City of Baltimore Edward Johnson has been elected.

THE DEFENCE OF NEW-ORLEANS.

The Richmond Whig makes mention of a publication about to be made for the purpose of showing "that General Adair, of Kentucky, was the efficient head of the American army," in the events that preceded the battle of New-Orleans: that the "plan of operations, and the disposition of the forces were arranged" by him; and thus transferring the honours of the brilliant victory, from General Jackson to him.

North Carolina Journal.

To the Editor of the Maryland Gazette.

Sir, The enemies of Gen. Jackson were peculiarly unfortunate in naming Gen. Adair, as the individual to whom the honour of the defence of New-Orleans is due. Had they been conversant with the history of the siege of that city, which is to be found in the official reports of the operations of our army, they would never have hazarded a vague and unfounded assertion. These reports are to be found in "Wall's Memoirs of Gen. Jackson," published in 1821. On consulting this work, it will be seen, that the first engagement between the American and British armies took place on the night of the 23d of December 1814, several miles below the city; and that "the twenty-fourth Gen. Jackson took his firm position," from which our army did not move until the discomfited British troops abandoned the siege and fled to their vessels. The second battle occurred on the 28th of December, and was commenced by the whole British army attacking the Americans in their lines. The third battle was fought on the 1st day of January 1815, when the British pushed forward the whole of their heavy artillery, and at the same time, with bombs and rockets, commenced an attack upon Jackson's whole line from the Mississippi to the Cypress Swamp. They were immediately answered by the messengers of death that were planted upon the heavy entrenchment, and by the rifles and muskets that were wielded by the troops who were secured behind it. The enemy were repulsed with great loss. The reader will understand from the foregoing, that the American line of fortifications was completed and occupied as early as the 28th of December, 1814, and that down to the 1st of January 1815, two unsuccessful attempts had been made upon them by the British army. Now, I would ask the administration editor who has essayed to impress on the public mind, the belief that the country is indebted to General Adair for the plan of operations and disposition of forces at the siege of Orleans, where General Adair was, at the periods of the three several engagements above mentioned? Also where was he at the time the fortifications for the defence of the place were planned and erected? Was Gen. Adair at Orleans? NO, he was not. He was hundreds of miles from that city, engaged in hastening the movements of the Kentucky troops destined to reinforce our army at that place. And such were the difficulties that this excellent officer had to encounter, that he did not arrive at New-Orleans with his division of Kentuckians, until the fourth day of January 1815. This was three days after the repulse of the British troops in their second attack upon Jackson's forces; and eleven days after the defence of the city had been planned and the American army had taken its final position." What part, therefore, could General Adair have taken in producing the events which preceded the battles of the 23d and 28th of December and 1st of January? As he was not present, it may be confidently asserted, that he took no part at all. The battle of the 8th of January was the only one in which Gen. Adair was engaged in the defence of Orleans; and in this, he displayed that gallantry which his reputation as a patriot and an officer, warranted his countrymen to expect.

I think, Sir, that enough has been said to show that Gen. Adair has no claim to the laurels worn by General Jackson. He who won them wears them, and the friends of the administration who have endeavoured to strip him of them, will find their labour productive only of shame to themselves and those they support. It is a trite saying, that "discreet friends are never to be dreaded than avowed enemies."

TRUTH.